


The Magistrate Judge recommended that Defendant's motion to dismiss be granted because she found that Plaintiff failed to allege facts showing conduct by Defendant that would support a claim of personal liability under Section 1983 against him. Plaintiff's objection (Doc. No. 45) does not directly challenge the reasoning of the Report and Recommendation. Instead, Plaintiff appears to simply re-state facts and arguments he previously made in opposition to Defendant's motion and the Magistrate Judge already considered in the Report and Recommendation. Thus, Plaintiff's objection does not provide a basis to reject or modify the Report and Recommendation. *See VanDiver v. Martin*, 304 F. Supp. 2d 934, 937 (E.D. Mich. 2004) ("An 'objection' that does nothing more than state a disagreement with a magistrate's suggested resolution, or simply summarizes what has been presented before, is not an 'objection' as that term is used in this context.").

Having reviewed the Report and Recommendation and considered Plaintiff's objection, the Court concludes that the Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 42) should be adopted and approved. Accordingly, Defendant's Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 30) is **GRANTED**.

It is so **ORDERED**.


WILLIAM L. CAMPBELL, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE